10, line 65, refers to preparing the TIFF data for ink jet printer output with the RIP herein, and Col. 11, line 12 refers to the "profile of compensating the difference between the color reproduction regions". Ito does not teach how to apply the profile to the TIFF data, either prior to the RIP or applying it to the TIFF image in Photoshop prior to the RIP. If Ito is applying the profile after the RIP be does not state how to do so. If Ito is applying a color profile after the RIP as per his Fig 2, then the image out of Ito's RIP is not binary, rather it must contain color information such that there is more than two levels per pixel. The input used to make the proof is a multi-level per pixel image. Ito specifies the content of the test target as having 239 color chips, Col. 11, line12-14. This implies that the TIFF file to which the profile is applied has multiple levels per pixel. Changing colors or performing selective color edit may be performed within Photoshop. Photoshop may also be used to apply a profile with a RIP prior to screening. Applicant is not aware of any data method of applying a profile to screened binary bitmap data. The invention describes how to adjust the dot gain of a screened binary bitmap, but it does not describe how to apply a color profile. Applying a profile to change one on color to a different on color does not make a lot of sense. Ito implies that he is correcting many colors, so the image that the profile is working with may not be a binary bitmap with binary pixels.

The Office Action cites Barry et al. (Figure 2, clement 205: IMAGE DATA) sent to dot-gain processor (Figure 2, element 200) for conditioning the binary image data with DOT GAIN elements (232, 234, 236, 238) to introduce a predetermined level of dot-gain before transmitted to a color proofer (Figures5A-5B, element 500: DIRECT DIGITAL COLOR PROOFING (DDCP) SYSTEM). However Barry et al. teaches that after applying dot-size lookup tables the resulting contone values are electronically screened, (Col. 4, lines 40-45), to yield appropriate binary bit-mapped values. Furthermore, (Col. 4, lines 51-57), specifies that the dot size table preferably exists within a raster image processor (RIP) which accepts incoming contone files. These contone files are the original artwork and are not the same as the binary halftone files created from a first rip with a first dot-gain curve as specified in our invention. Thus Barry et al. does not teach one how to modify binary halftone data to modify the dot-gain nor create a proof. The contone files consist of pixels that have more than two levels per pixel. The input used to proof is not a binary bitmap file.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 1 8 2007

The Office Action has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's admission as prior art in view of Ito et al. (U.S. 6,378,983) and Barry et al. (U.S. 5,309,246), and further in view of Donhnomae (U.S. 6,072,588). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action cites Dohnomae as disclosing a method of an apparatus for generating proof in which an image bit map data (binary digital data) used to generate a proof for a printed color document is processed (convoluted) with a filtering process for cutting off a spatial frequency response spatial filtering, Col. 4, lines 20-32. Dohnomae, Figure 1, shows an image being read, S1, to create gradation image data, 1a, and converted into colors, S2, to create halftone-dot area percentage data, aj, which is then further processed with the step of comparing threshold with data, S10, to create the color proof, CPb. The step of comparing threshold with data S10 is a screening operation, normally performed within a raster image processor. The input to this step is the original artwork converted into halftone-dot area percentage data. The input is not a binary bitmap file. Dohnomae also shows creating of the bit map data, bj, using step compare threshold with data, S5, prior to the process-plate film, 16, step and creation of the print, P. The present invention operates directly on the binary bitmap data, bj, and does not use the original artwork 1a, nor the halftone-dot area percentage data, aj. Dohnomae does not teach how to create a color proof from the original binary bitmap data, bj, used to create the printed color document, P. Dohnomae teaches to screen the original image twice, using two threshold matrixes, 14, 24. Dohnomae's halftone-dot area percentage data is multi-level. Each pixel contains a level between 0 and 100%. The input to the proofing data stream is not a binary, one of two, level pixel.

CONCLUSION

None of the prior art cited in the Office Action teaches how to modify screened halftone binary bitmaps to adjust dot gain. All of the prior art applies dot gain or color profiles to original continuous tone or multilevel pixel data. Then the modified data requires screening in order to image on a binary device.

Dependent claims not specifically addressed add additional limitations to the independent claims, which have been distinguished from the prior art and are therefore also patentable.

In conclusion, none of the prior art cited by the Office Action discloses the limitations of the claims of the present invention, either individually or in combination. Therefore, it is believed that the claims are allowable.

If the Examiner is of the opinion that additional modifications to the claims are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, he is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the number listed below for a telephone interview and Examiner's amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Draft

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 29,134

Nelson A. Blish/tmp
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-588-2720
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.